Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed November 29, 2006, the Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-28 remain pending in this application and currently stand rejected.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Hillery for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 30, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicant highlighted claim amendments to the Examiner, and expressed a desire to further prosecution. However, no agreement was made regarding rejected claim patentability.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. The Office Action states that claims 14-19 do not produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result, which under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 14 has been amended and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Applicant submits that the presentation of scope search suggestions which focus on identifying tagged data items in an electronic document, and displaying at least a portion of the electronic document using the tagged data items, as recited in claim 14, produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result. The display of at least a portion of the electronic document is a

concrete and tangible result. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 14-19 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 14 has been amended to address this rejection, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 6-22 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,175,830 by Maynard (hereinafter *Maynard*) in further view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0040311 by Douglass et al. (hereinafter *Douglass*). Claims 1, 14 and 20 have been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method for displaying one or more tagged data items proximate to a result of a search of an electronic document comprising, *inter alia*, determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result.

Claim 14 recites a computer-implemented method for identifying one or more tagged data items proximate to a result of a search of an electronic document comprising, *inter alia*, determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should

be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying at least a portion of the electronic document using the tagged data items.

Claim 20 recites a computer-readable storage device storing a set of computer-executable instructions implementing a method for displaying one or more tagged data items proximate to a result of a search of an electronic document comprising, *inter alia*, determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence; and displaying on a user interface the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result, wherein the one or more tagged items identified as within the distance from each search result are displayed in a window separate from a window displaying content of the electronic document.

Maynard discloses an information management retrieval and display system for searching through an informational resource, such as a document, a number of individual documents, or a stream of information and for displaying the results of the search in a collapsible/expandable format based upon a user-selected display criteria or hierarchy. (*See Maynard* column 5, lines 42-52.) A hierarchy selection, of *Maynard*, informs a search module of the type of display format that a user wishes to see the results displayed. (*See Maynard* column 6, lines 46-48.) The hierarchy selection, of *Maynard*, will inform the search module whether or not the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based entirely upon the information contained within the categorical tags (research-centric), if the search results are to be displayed in an order depending entirely upon the frequency of the key words or phrases present within the finite elements (conventional), or if the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based upon a combination of the two (document-centric). (*See Maynard* column 6, lines 48-57.)

Douglass discloses a computer-readable medium is provided which automatically rates web pages 12 based on pre-designated, project-based keywords 14 during research in which results are saved in association with a project 20. (*See Douglass* paragraph [0018].) *Douglass* also discloses a computer processor (on a PC on which the software is running) that applies calculation logic stored in a method 10 to automatically calculate statistics and/or relevancy ratings 24 based on keywords 14 found in the document 12 (using algorithms for frequency, location, density, proximity, Autorank and matches, for example). (*See Douglass* paragraph [0020].)

In contrast with the claimed invention, the combination of *Maynard* and *Douglass* fails to teach or suggest, determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result, as recited in Claim 1. *Maynard* is completely silent with respect to using semantic intelligence to determine whether one or more tagged items should be associated with a search result, but instead discloses a selected display criteria that will define if the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based entirely upon the information contained within the categorical tags. (*See Maynard* column 2, lines 32-35.) Accordingly, *Maynard* merely searches an informational resource and displays the results of a search in a collapsible/expandable format, and fails to teach or suggest extracting information associated with a search term.

Douglass fails to teach or suggest determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with

each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result, as recited in Claim 1. While *Douglass* may calculate statistics and relevancy ratings, *Douglass* does not use semantic intelligence to determine whether one or more tagged items should be associated with a search result. (*See Douglass* paragraph [0020].) *Douglass* is merely directed to a web browser rating page and fails to teach or suggest, extracting information associated with a search term. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-13 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-13.

Claims 14 and 20 include limitations similar to the limitations mentioned above with respect to Claim 1, and are patentably distinguishable from the cited art for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 14 and 20. Dependent Claims 15-19 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 14, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 15-19. Dependent Claims 21-28 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding Independent Claim 20, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 21-28.

Claims 3-5, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maynard* in further view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0212673 by Kadayam et al.

(hereinafter *Kadayam*). Claims 1 and 20 have been amended and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Claims 3-5 depend from Claims 1 and are allowable over the combination of *Maynard* and *Douglass* for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Claims 23 and 24 depend from Claims 20 and are allowable over the combination of *Maynard* and *Douglass* for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 20. In addition, the Office Action acknowledges that *Maynard* fails to disclose all the limitations of Claims 3-5, 23 and 24. In order to overcome these deficiencies in *Maynard*, the Office Action relies on *Kadayam*. However, the combination of *Maynard*, *Douglass* and *Kadayam* fails to disclose all the limitations of Claims 3-5, 23 and 24.

Kadayam discloses an enterprise-scale system and method for searching and retrieving electronic information from disparate electronic information sources within a large organization (an intranet) and/or from the Internet. (*See Kadayam* paragraph [0006].) *Kadayam* discloses a "federated search" architecture and system that enables a single search query from a user to be delivered in real-time to various selected islands of information. (*See Kadayam* paragraph [0006].) The system of *Kadayam* can collate results, removes duplicates and dead-links, apply composite relevance scoring, and deliver the relevant results to the user. (*See Kadayam* paragraph [0006].)

Kadayam fails to teach or suggest determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result, as recited in Claim 1. While *Kadayam* may mention using an intelligent source selection function, Kadayam

merely utilizes the intelligent source selection to provide a sub-set of information sources to perform a search, and fails to use semantic intelligence to determine whether one or more tagged items should be associated with a search result. (*See Kadayam* paragraph [0053].) *Kadayam* is merely directed to the retrieval and organization of information from a plurality of information sources, not extracting information associated with a search term. Accordingly, the combination of *Maynard*, *Douglass* and *Kadayam* fails to disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 3-5 are allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent Claims 3-5.

Claim 20 includes limitations similar to the limitations mentioned above with respect to Claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from the combination of *Maynard*, *Douglass* and *Kadayam* for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Dependent Claims 23 and 24 are allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 20, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 23 and 24.

CONCLUSION

A request for a three-month extension of time is requested for the period of February 28, 2007, through May 29, 2007, and is submitted with this amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: May 29, 2007

Devon K. Grant
Reg. No. 57,036

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100